

RALPH JOHN DE LA CRUZ

*Institute of Mathematics, University of the Philippines  
Diliman, Quezon City 1105, Philippines  
(E-Mail: rjdelacruz@math.upd.edu.ph)*

PHILIP SALTENBERGER

*Institute for Numerical Analysis, TU Braunschweig  
Universitätsplatz 2, 38106 Braunschweig, Germany  
(E-Mail: philip.saltenberger@tu-bs.de)  
Corresponding author*

## DENSITY OF DIAGONALIZABLE MATRICES IN SETS OF STRUCTURED MATRICES DEFINED FROM INDEFINITE SCALAR PRODUCTS

### Abstract

For an (indefinite) scalar product  $[x, y]_B = x^H B y$  for  $B = \pm B^H \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$  on  $\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n$  we show that the set of diagonalizable matrices is dense in the set of all  $B$ -selfadjoint,  $B$ -skewadjoint,  $B$ -unitary and  $B$ -normal matrices.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Whenever  $B \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$  is some arbitrary (nonsingular) matrix, the function

$$[\cdot, \cdot]_B : \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (x, y) \mapsto x^H B y \quad (x^H := \overline{x}^T)$$

defines a nondegenerate sesquilinear form on  $\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n$ . In case  $B$  is not necessarily Hermitian positive definite, such forms are also referred to as indefinite scalar products [12, Sec. 2]. In this work, we particularly consider such products for the cases  $B = B^H$ ,  $B = -B^H$  (with  $B^H$  denoting the conjugate transpose of  $B$ ) and  $B^H B = I_n$  (i.e.  $B$  is unitary). Indefinite scalar products with  $B = \pm B^H$  are called orthosymmetric while those with  $B^H = B^{-1}$  are called unitary [12, Def. 3.1, 4.1].

Several classes of matrices  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  are naturally related to  $[\cdot, \cdot]_B$ :

- (a) A matrix  $J \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  is called  $B$ -selfadjoint if  $[Jx, y]_B = [x, Jy]_B$  holds for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . It follows that  $x^H J^H B y = x^H B J y$  holds for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$  if  $J$  is  $B$ -selfadjoint. This means we have  $J^H B = B J$ , that is,  $J = B^{-1} J^H B$ . The set of  $B$ -selfadjoint matrices is denoted by  $\mathbb{J}(B)$ .

- (b) A matrix  $L \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  is called  $B$ -skewadjoint if  $[Lx, y]_B = [x, -Ly]_B$  holds for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . It follows from this equation as in (a) that  $L$  is  $B$ -skewadjoint if and only if  $-L = B^{-1}L^H B$ . The set of all  $B$ -skewadjoint matrices is denoted by  $\mathbb{L}(B)$ .
- (c) A matrix  $G \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  is called  $B$ -unitary if  $[Gx, Gy]_B = [x, y]_B$  holds for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . This means that  $x^H G^H B G y = x^H B y$  has to hold for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$  and implies that  $G^H B G = B$ . The set of all  $B$ -unitary matrices is denoted by  $\mathbb{G}(B)$ .
- (d) A matrix  $N \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  is called  $B$ -normal if  $NB^{-1}N^H B = B^{-1}N^H B N$  holds. The set of all  $B$ -normal matrices is denoted by  $\mathcal{N}(B)$ <sup>1</sup>.

A great many of problems in control systems theory, matrix equations or differential equations involve matrices from the classes of matrices defined above (see, e.g., [10, 12] and the references therein). The monograph [4] contains a comprehensive treatment and applications for the Hermitian case  $B = B^H$ .

Assume  $B = I_n$  is the  $n \times n$  identity matrix. Then the sets of  $B$ -selfadjoint,  $B$ -skewadjoint,  $B$ -unitary and  $B$ -normal matrices  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  coincide with the sets of Hermitian ( $A = A^H$ ), skew-Hermitian ( $A = -A^H$ ), unitary ( $A^H A = I_n$ ) and normal ( $AA^H = A^H A$ ) matrices. It is a well-known fact that every matrix belonging to any of these four sets of matrices is semisimple, i.e., diagonalizable [6]. In case  $B \neq I_n$  the situation is different: for instance, consider the  $n \times n$  reverse identity matrix  $R_n$  (which is Hermitian but not positive definite) and some basic  $n \times n$  Jordan block  $J(\lambda)$  for some  $\lambda$ , i.e.

$$J(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 1 & & & \\ & \lambda & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & \lambda & 1 \\ & & & & \lambda \end{bmatrix}, \quad R_n = \begin{bmatrix} & & & & 1 \\ & & & 1 & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & 1 & & & \\ 1 & & & & \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

If  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $J(\lambda) \in \mathbb{J}(R_n)$ . However,  $J(\lambda)$  is the prototype of a matrix which is not diagonalizable (see also [4, Ex. 4.2.1]). Similar examples can be found for the other types of matrices and other  $B$ . In general, for a (skew)-Hermitian matrix  $B$ , a matrix  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  belonging to  $\mathbb{J}(B), \mathbb{L}(B), \mathbb{G}(B)$  or  $\mathcal{N}(B)$  need not be semisimple. Thus, given some (skew)-Hermitian  $B \in \mathbf{G}\mathbf{L}_n(\mathbb{C})$ , the following question arises: “How large is the subset of semisimple matrices in the sets  $\mathbb{J}(B), \mathbb{L}(B), \mathbb{G}(B)$  and  $\mathcal{N}(B)$ ?” The answer to this question is simply “every matrix is semisimple” in case  $B = I_n$  (and whenever  $B$  is Hermitian positive definite), but seems to be unknown for general indefinite or skew-Hermitian  $B$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>Notice that the set  $\mathcal{N}(B)$  includes the sets  $\mathbb{J}(B), \mathbb{L}(B)$  and  $\mathbb{G}(B)$ .

In this work we consider the question raised above from a topological point of view. Recall that  $\mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  can be considered as a topological space with basis  $B_R(A) = \{A' \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C}) : \|A - A'\| < R\}$  for  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  and  $R \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $R > 0$  (see, e.g. [7, Sec. 11.2]). The sets  $\mathbb{J}(B), \mathbb{L}(B), \mathbb{G}(B)$  and  $\mathcal{N}(B)$  can thus be interpreted as topological spaces on their own equipped with the subspace topology [1, Sec. 1.5]. For instance, a subset  $S \subset \mathcal{N}(B)$  is open (in this subspace topology) if  $S$  is the intersection of  $\mathcal{N}(B)$  with some open subset of  $\mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . If a property does not hold for all elements in a topological space, it is usually reasonable to ask whether it holds for a dense subset. Thus, a second question, in this context naturally related to the first one, is “As not all matrices in  $\mathbb{J}(B), \mathbb{L}(B), \mathbb{G}(B)$  or  $\mathcal{N}(B)$  are semisimple, is the subset of semisimple matrices in these sets at least dense?”

Since the sets  $\mathbb{J}(B), \mathbb{L}(B), \mathbb{G}(B)$  and  $\mathcal{N}(B)$  are defined by matrix equations, they are (topologically) closed subsets of  $\mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  (for instance,  $N \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  is  $B$ -normal if and only if it satisfies the equation  $NB^{-1}N^HB = B^{-1}N^HB$ ). Consequently, although the set of semisimple matrices is dense in  $\mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  [11, Cor. 7.3.3], there is no direct reasoning why this fact should carry over to  $\mathbb{J}(B), \mathbb{L}(B), \mathbb{G}(B)$  or  $\mathcal{N}(B)$ . In fact, a closed subset of  $\mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  need not contain any diagonalizable matrix at all (see [7] for an example). This work is devoted to the second question raised above and gives a positive answer. Our main result can be stated as follows:

**Main result.** Let  $B = \pm B^H \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . Then the set of diagonalizable matrices is dense in  $\mathbb{J}(B), \mathbb{L}(B), \mathbb{G}(B)$  and  $\mathcal{N}(B)$ .

Here we will work with the 2-norm of matrices<sup>2</sup>, i.e.

$$\|A\|_2 := \max_{\|x\|_2=1} \|Ax\|_2.$$

The density result stated above is thus equivalent to the fact that, for any  $A \in \mathbb{J}(B), \mathbb{L}(B), \mathbb{G}(B)$  or  $\mathcal{N}(B)$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists some diagonalizable  $A'$  from the same class of matrices such that  $\|A - A'\|_2 < \varepsilon$ . Our motivation for the analysis of density stems from the fact that, for certain  $B$  such as  $B = R_n$  (with  $R_n$  as in (1)) or

$$B = J_{2n} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_n \\ -I_n & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbf{M}_{2n}(\mathbb{R}),$$

semisimple matrices in  $\mathbb{J}(B), \mathbb{L}(B), \mathbb{G}(B)$  or  $\mathcal{N}(B)$  can all be transformed to a sparse and nicely structured (canonical) form by a  $B$ -unitary similarity transformation as shown in [2]. From this point of view our results imply that, even if the transformation established in [2] does not exist for some specific matrix  $A \in \mathbb{J}(B), \mathbb{L}(B), \mathbb{G}(B)$  or  $\mathcal{N}(B)$ , it will exist for matrices arbitrarily close to  $A$  from the same structure class.

---

<sup>2</sup>Our results hold in the same way for any submultiplicative and unitarily invariant matrix norm.

In Section 2 some preliminaries and basic results are given. Section 3 gives the proofs for the main results on the density of semisimple matrices in  $\mathbb{J}(B)$ ,  $\mathbb{L}(B)$ ,  $\mathbb{G}(B)$  and  $\mathcal{N}(B)$ . We focus on the case  $B = B^H$  in Sections 3.1 to 3.3 and discuss the case  $B = -B^H$  in Section 3.4. Some conclusions are given in Section 4.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES AND BASIC RESULTS

The set of all  $j \times k$  matrices over  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$  is denoted by  $\mathbf{M}_{j \times k}(\mathbb{F})$ . Whenever  $j = k$ , we use the short-hand-notation  $\mathbf{M}_k(\mathbb{F}) = \mathbf{M}_{k \times k}(\mathbb{F})$ . The notation  $\mathbf{GL}_k(\mathbb{F})$  refers to the general linear group over  $\mathbb{F}^k$  (i.e. the set of  $k \times k$  nonsingular matrices over  $\mathbb{F}$ ). The set of all eigenvalues of a matrix  $A \in \mathbf{M}_k(\mathbb{C})$  is called the spectrum of  $A$  and is denoted  $\sigma(A)$ . The multiplicity of an eigenvalue  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  as a root of  $\det(A - xI_k)$  is called its algebraic multiplicity and is denoted by  $\mathbf{m}(A, \lambda)$ . For each  $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$  any vector  $v \in \mathbb{C}^k$  that satisfies  $Av = \lambda v$  is called an eigenvector for  $\lambda$ . The set of all those vectors corresponding to  $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$  is called the eigenspace for  $\lambda$ . It is a subspace of  $\mathbb{C}^k$  and its dimension is called the geometric multiplicity of  $\lambda$ . The conjugate transpose of a vector/matrix is denoted with the superscript  $^H$  while  $^T$  is used for the transposition without complex conjugation. A matrix  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  is called semisimple (or diagonalizable), if there exists some  $S \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$  such that  $S^{-1}AS$  is a diagonal matrix.

Let  $B \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . For any  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  let  $A^* := B^{-1}A^HB$ . The matrix  $A^*$  is usually referred to as the adjoint for  $A$ , cf. [12, Sec.2]. The sets of all  $B$ -selfadjoint,  $B$ -skewadjoint,  $B$ -unitary and  $B$ -normal matrices as introduced in Section 1 can now be characterized by the equations  $A = A^*$ ,  $A = -A^*$ ,  $A^* = A^{-1}$  and  $AA^* = A^*A$ , respectively. Notice that the mapping  $*$  :  $A \mapsto A^*$  is  $\mathbb{R}$ -linear, that is, for any  $A, C \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  and any  $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$  it holds that

$$(\alpha A + \gamma C)^* = \alpha A^* + \gamma C^*.$$

Moreover,  $(AC)^* = C^*A^*$  holds, so  $*$  is antihomomorphic.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $B \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . Then the sets  $\mathbb{J}(B)$  and  $\mathbb{L}(B)$  are  $\mathbb{R}$ -subspaces of  $\mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . Moreover,  $\mathbb{G}(B)$  is a subgroup of  $\mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ .*

*Proof.* The first statement follows immediately since  $*$  :  $A \mapsto A^*$  is  $\mathbb{R}$ -linear.

Now let  $G \in \mathbb{G}(B)$ . Then, as  $G^HBG = B$  holds,  $\det(G^H)\det(G) = 1$  follows, so  $G$  is nonsingular. Moreover,  $G^{-H}BG^{-1} = B$  follows, so  $G^{-1} \in \mathbb{G}(B)$ . Finally, for  $G, F \in \mathbb{G}(B)$ , we obtain

$$(FG)^HB(FG) = G^H(F^HBFG)G = G^HBG = B.$$

Therefore,  $FG \in \mathbb{G}(B)$ . Since  $I_n \in \mathbb{G}(B)$ , the proof is complete.  $\square$

The sets  $\mathbb{J}(B)$  and  $\mathbb{L}(B)$  are often referred to as the Jordan and Lie algebras (cf. [12, Sec. 2]) for  $[\cdot, \cdot]_B$  since  $\mathbb{J}(B)$  is closed under the operation  $A \odot C := \frac{1}{2}(AC + CA)$  whereas  $\mathbb{L}(B)$  is closed under the Lie bracket  $[A, C] := AC - CA$ . The following Corollary 1 shows that  $\mathbb{J}(B)$  and  $\mathbb{L}(B)$  can never be  $\mathbb{C}$ -subspaces of  $\mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . In fact, multiplication by  $i$  gives a possibility to easily switch between the sets  $\mathbb{J}(B)$  and  $\mathbb{L}(B)$ .

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $B \in \mathbf{G}\mathbf{l}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . If  $J \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ , then  $iJ \in \mathbb{L}(B)$ . On the other hand, if  $L \in \mathbb{L}(B)$ , then  $iL \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $J \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ . Notice that

$$B^{-1}(iJ)^H B = B^{-1}(-iJ^H)B = -i(B^{-1}J^H B) = -iJ$$

for any  $J \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ . Thus  $iJ \in \mathbb{L}(B)$ . On the other hand, if  $L \in \mathbb{L}(B)$ , then  $B^{-1}(iL)^H B = -iB^{-1}L^H B = iL$ , so  $iL \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ .  $\square$

The following Lemma 2 can easily be verified by a straight forward calculation (see also [13, Sec. 1]). Therefore, the proof is omitted.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $B \in \mathbf{G}\mathbf{l}_n(\mathbb{C})$  and  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . Furthermore, let  $T \in \mathbf{G}\mathbf{l}_n(\mathbb{C})$  and consider*

$$A' := T^{-1}AT \quad \text{and} \quad B' := T^H B T.$$

*Then  $A$  is  $B$ -selfadjoint/ $B$ -skewadjoint/ $B$ -unitary/ $B$ -normal if and only if  $A'$  is  $B'$ -selfadjoint/ $B'$ -skewadjoint/ $B'$ -unitary/ $B'$ -normal.*

Let  $B \in \mathbf{G}\mathbf{l}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . Then any  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  can always be expressed as  $A = S + K$  with

$$S = \frac{1}{2}(A + A^*) \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C}), \quad K := \frac{1}{2}(A - A^*) \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C}). \quad (2)$$

Assuming that  $B = \pm B^H$ , it is easy to see that  $S \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  and  $K \in \mathbb{L}(B)$ . In this case,  $A = S + K$  can be interpreted as a  $B$ -analogue of the Toeplitz decomposition stated in [8, Thm. 4.1.2]. The next Lemma 3 shows that, in case  $B^H B = I_n$  additionally holds,  $S$  and  $K$  in (2) are the best approximations to  $A$  from  $\mathbb{J}(B)$  and  $\mathbb{L}(B)$  with respect to any unitarily invariant matrix norm. The proof of Lemma 3 is similar to [3, Thm. 2] (see also [15, Lem. 8.3]).

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $B = \pm B^H \in \mathbf{G}\mathbf{l}_n(\mathbb{C})$  with  $B^H B = I_n$  and let  $\|\cdot\|$  be any unitarily invariant matrix norm.*

- (a) *Let  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  and  $S := \frac{1}{2}(A + A^*)$ . Then  $S \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  and it holds that  $\|A - S\| \leq \|A - C\|$  for any other matrix  $C \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ .*
- (b) *Let  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  and  $K := \frac{1}{2}(A - A^*)$ . Then  $K \in \mathbb{L}(B)$  and it holds that  $\|A - K\| \leq \|A - C\|$  for any other matrix  $C \in \mathbb{L}(B)$ .*

*Proof.* (a) Let  $\|\cdot\|$  be some unitarily invariant matrix norm and let  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  be given. It follows from  $B = \pm B^H$  that  $(A^*)^* = A$ . Therefore, we have  $S^* = \frac{1}{2}(A + A^*)^* = \frac{1}{2}(A^* + A) = S$ , so  $S \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ .

Now let  $C \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  be arbitrary. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|A - S\| &= (1/2)\|A - A^*\| = \|(A - C) - (A^* - C)\| \\ &= (1/2)\|(A - C) - (A - C)^*\| \leq (1/2)(\|A - C\| + \|(A - C)^*\|) \\ &= (1/2)(\|A - C\| + \|(A - C)^H\|) = \|A - C\|. \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion we have  $\|A - S\| \leq \|A - C\|$ . The proof for (b) proceeds along the same lines.  $\square$

Let

$$J_k(\lambda) := \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 1 & & & \\ & \lambda & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & \lambda & 1 \\ & & & & \lambda \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbf{M}_k(\mathbb{C})$$

denote a basic Jordan block for  $\lambda$  if  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and define  $J_k(\lambda) = J_{\tilde{k}}(\lambda) \oplus J_{\tilde{k}}(\bar{\lambda})$  with  $2\tilde{k} = k$  in case  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ . Here and in the following, the notation  $\oplus$  is used to denote the direct sum of two matrices, i.e.  $X \oplus Y = \text{diag}(X, Y)$ . The next two theorems for the case when  $B = B^H$  are taken from [4] and will be useful for some proofs in Section 3. For convenience, we omit the subscript  $k$  for the Jordan blocks in Theorem 1.

**Theorem 1** ([4, Thm. 5.1.1]). *Let  $B = B^H \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$  and  $A \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ . Then there is some  $T \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$  such that  $T^{-1}AT = J$  and  $T^H BT = \tilde{B}$  where*

$$J = J(\lambda_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus J(\lambda_\alpha) \oplus J(\lambda_{\alpha+1}) \oplus \cdots \oplus J(\lambda_\beta)$$

*is a Jordan normal form for  $A$  where  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\alpha$  are the real eigenvalues of  $A$  and  $\lambda_{\alpha+1}, \dots, \lambda_\beta$  are the nonreal eigenvalues of  $A$  from the upper half-plane. Moreover,*

$$\tilde{B} := T^H BT = \eta_1 P_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \eta_\alpha P_\alpha \oplus P_{\alpha+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus P_\beta$$

*where, for  $k = 1, \dots, \beta$ ,  $P_k = R_p$  is the  $p \times p$  reverse identity matrix (see also (1)) with  $p \times p$  being the size of  $J(\lambda_k)$  and  $\eta = \{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\alpha\}$  is an ordered set of signs  $\pm 1$ .*

The transformation defined in Theorem 2 can be interpreted as a  $B$ -analogue of the well-known Cayley transform [5].

**Theorem 2** ([4, Prop. 4.3.4]). *Let  $B = B^H \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$  and  $A \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ . Let  $w \in \mathbb{C}$  be a nonreal number with  $w \notin \sigma(A)$  and let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|\alpha| = 1$ . Then*

$$U = \alpha(A - \bar{w}I_n)(A - wI_n)^{-1} \in \mathbb{G}(B) \quad (3)$$

and  $\alpha \notin \sigma(U)$ . Conversely, if  $U \in \mathbb{G}(B)$ ,  $|\alpha| = 1$  and  $\alpha \notin \sigma(U)$ , then for any  $w \neq \bar{w}$  we have

$$A = (wU - \bar{w}\alpha I_n)(U - \alpha I_n)^{-1} \in \mathbb{J}(B) \quad (4)$$

and  $w \notin \sigma(A)$ . The formulas (3) and (4) are inverse to one other.

## 2.1 Symmetric Polynomials and 1-Regularity

A matrix  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  is called 1-regular<sup>3</sup>, if the eigenspace for any  $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$  is one-dimensional. In particular,  $A$  is 1-regular if and only if there is only one basic Jordan block for each eigenvalue  $\lambda$  in the Jordan decomposition of  $A$ . This implies that a diagonalizable matrix is 1-regular if and only if all its eigenvalues are (pairwise) distinct. Moreover, it follows directly that 1-regularity is preserved under similarity transformations.

The following Theorem 3 characterizes 1-regular matrices and is of central importance in the further discussion.

**Theorem 3** ([14, Prop. 1.1.2]). *Let  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . Then each of the following statements is equivalent to  $A$  being 1-regular.*

- (a) *The centralizer of  $A$  in  $\mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  coincides with  $\mathbb{C}[A]$ . That is, for all  $A' \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  commuting with  $A$ , there is some polynomial  $p(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$  such that  $A' = p(A)$ .*
- (b) *The dimension of  $\mathbb{C}[A]$  equals  $n$ , i.e. the matrices  $I_n, A, A^2, \dots, A^{n-1}$  are linearly independent over  $\mathbb{C}$ .*

The next Proposition 1 shows that, for any given  $A \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  we can always find a 1-regular matrix from  $\mathbb{J}(B)$  that commutes with  $A$ . From now on we confine ourselves to the case  $B = B^H$  and postpone the discussion of the situation for  $B = -B^H$  to Subsection 3.4.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $B = B^H \in \mathbf{G}\mathbf{l}_n(\mathbb{C})$  and  $A \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ . Then there exists a 1-regular matrix  $C \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  such that  $A$  and  $C$  commute.*

*Proof.* We apply Theorem 1 to  $A$  and  $B$  (the subscript indicating the size of the Jordan blocks is omitted). So, there exists some  $T \in \mathbf{G}\mathbf{l}_n(\mathbb{C})$  such that

$$\tilde{A} := T^{-1}AT = J(\lambda_1) \oplus \dots \oplus J(\lambda_\alpha) \oplus J(\lambda_{\alpha+1}) \oplus \dots \oplus J(\lambda_\beta)$$

where  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  are the real eigenvalues of  $A$  and  $\lambda_{\alpha+1}, \dots, \lambda_\beta \in \mathbb{C}$  are the nonreal eigenvalues of  $A$  from the upper half-plane. Moreover,

$$\tilde{B} := T^H BT = \eta_1 P_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \eta_\alpha P_\alpha \oplus P_{\alpha+1} \oplus \dots \oplus P_\beta$$

---

<sup>3</sup>A 1-regular matrix is sometimes also called nonderogatory.

where, for  $k = 1, \dots, \beta$ ,  $P_k = R_p$  (the  $p \times p$  reverse identity matrix, see (1)) with  $p \times p$  being the size of  $J(\lambda_k)$ , and each  $\eta_j$  is either  $+1$  or  $-1$ . According to Lemma 2 we have  $\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{J}(\tilde{B})$  since  $A \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ . Now let  $a_1, \dots, a_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $a_{\alpha+1}, \dots, a_\beta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$  be arbitrary and pairwise distinct values and consider

$$\tilde{C} := J(a_1) \oplus \dots \oplus J(a_\alpha) \oplus J(a_{\alpha+1}) \oplus \dots \oplus J(a_\beta)$$

where each  $J(a_k)$  has the same size as  $J(\lambda_k)$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, \beta$ . Observe that  $\tilde{C} \in \mathbb{J}(\tilde{B})$  and that  $\tilde{A}\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}\tilde{A}$  holds. Moreover,  $\tilde{C}$  is 1-regular since the values  $a_k$  are all distinct. We now apply the reverse transformation to obtain

$$A = T\tilde{A}T^{-1}, \quad C := T\tilde{C}T^{-1}, \quad B = T^{-H}\tilde{B}T^{-1}.$$

Note that now  $AC = CA$  holds and that  $C \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  (according to Proposition 2 since we had  $\tilde{C} \in \mathbb{J}(\tilde{B})$ ). Finally, as  $\tilde{C}$  was 1-regular so is  $C$ .  $\square$

Using Corollary 1, the result from Proposition 1 can easily be extended to  $\mathbb{L}(B)$ .

**Corollary 2.** *Let  $B = B^H \in \mathbf{G}\mathbf{l}_n(\mathbb{C})$  and  $A \in \mathbb{L}(B)$ . Then there exists a 1-regular matrix  $C \in \mathbb{L}(B)$  such that  $A$  and  $C$  commute.*

*Proof.* This follows immediately from Corollary 1 and Proposition 1. Additionally, notice that  $C \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  is 1-regular if and only if  $iC$  is 1-regular.  $\square$

A polynomial  $p(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  in  $n \geq 1$  unknowns is called symmetric if

$$p(x_1, \dots, x_n) = p(x_{\tau(1)}, \dots, x_{\tau(n)})$$

holds for all permutations  $\tau$  of  $1, 2, \dots, n$ . The following Theorem 4 will be central in the next section.

**Theorem 4** ([14, Prop. 7.1.10]). *Let  $p(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  be a symmetric polynomial and  $f : \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a function given by*

$$f(A) = p(\lambda_1(A), \lambda_2(A), \dots, \lambda_n(A)) =: p(A)$$

where  $\lambda_k(A)$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , denote the eigenvalues of  $A$ . Then there is a polynomial  $q(x_{11}, x_{12}, \dots, x_{nn}) \in \mathbb{C}[x_{11}, x_{12}, \dots, x_{nn}]$  in  $n^2$  unknowns such that

$$f(A) = q(a_{11}, a_{12}, \dots, a_{nn}) \quad \forall A = [a_{i,j}]_{i,j} \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C}).$$

*Proof.* The proof follows the one from [14]. Let  $A = [a_{i,j}]_{i,j} \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  and let  $\chi_A(x) = \det(xI_n - A)$  be the characteristic polynomial of  $A$ . Assume that

$$\chi_A(x) = x^n + c_1x^{n-1} + \dots + c_{n-1}x + c_n. \quad (5)$$

for some  $c_k \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n$ . It is well known that  $c_1, \dots, c_n$  are polynomials in the entries  $a_{ij}$ ,  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ , of  $A$ .



Furthermore, let  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}$  denote the eigenvalues of  $A$ . Then  $\chi_A(x) = (x - \lambda_1)(x - \lambda_2) \cdots (x - \lambda_n)$  and its expansion gives

$$\chi_A(x) = x^n - s_1 x^{n-1} + s_2 x^{n-2} + \cdots + (-1)^n s_n \quad (6)$$

for the coefficients  $s_1, \dots, s_n \in \mathbb{C}$ . A closer inspection reveals that  $s_1, \dots, s_n$  are given by the  $n$  elementary symmetric polynomials in  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  (see also [9, Sec. 2]), that is

$$s_1 = \sum_i \lambda_i, \quad s_2 = \sum_{i < j} \lambda_i \lambda_j, \quad s_3 = \sum_{i < j < k} \lambda_i \lambda_j \lambda_k, \quad \dots, \quad s_n = \prod_i \lambda_i. \quad (7)$$

A comparison of coefficients in (5) and (6) yields: each elementary symmetric polynomial  $s_k = s_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  in (7) in the eigenvalues of  $A$  agrees with a certain polynomial  $c_k = p_k(a_{11}, a_{12}, \dots, a_{nn})$  in the entries  $a_{ij}$  of  $A$ . In consequence, this is true for any symmetric polynomial  $q(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  since  $q$  can always be expressed as a polynomial in  $s_1, \dots, s_n$  (cf. [9, Thm. 2.20]).  $\square$

**Example 1.** We give three applications of Theorem 4 that will be important in the further discussion. Each of these examples can be found in [14, Sec. 7]. First, let  $A = [a_{ij}]_{ij} \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  with eigenvalues  $\lambda_1(A), \dots, \lambda_n(A)$ .

(i) The function  $p : \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  given by

$$p(A) := p(\lambda_1(A), \dots, \lambda_n(A)) = \prod_k \lambda_k(A)$$

determines whether  $A$  is invertible. That is,  $p(A) = 0$  if  $A$  is singular and  $p(A) \neq 0$  otherwise. As  $p$  is a symmetric polynomial in  $\lambda_1(A), \dots, \lambda_n(A)$ , there is some  $q(x_{11}, \dots, x_{nn})$  in  $n^2$  unknowns with  $q(A) := q(a_{11}, a_{12}, \dots, a_{nn}) = p(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . The polynomial  $q$  in  $a_{11}, a_{12}, \dots, a_{nn}$  is given by the determinant.

(ii) The function  $p : \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  given by

$$p(A) := p(\lambda_1(A), \dots, \lambda_n(A)) = \prod_{k \neq j} (\lambda_k(A) - \lambda_j(A)),$$

determines whether  $A$  has a multiple eigenvalue. That is,  $p(A) \neq 0$  if all eigenvalues of  $A$  are (pairwise) distinct and  $p(A) = 0$  otherwise. Notice that  $p(\lambda_1(A), \dots, \lambda_n(A))$  is a symmetric polynomial in  $\lambda_1(A), \dots, \lambda_n(A)$ . According to Theorem 4, there exists a polynomial  $q \in \mathbb{C}[x_{11}, \dots, x_{nn}]$  in  $n^2$  unknowns such that

$$q(A) = q(a_{11}, a_{12}, \dots, a_{nn}) = p(\lambda_1(A), \dots, \lambda_n(A)) = p(A)$$

for all  $A = [a_{ij}]_{ij} \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ .

- (iii) Now assume  $A = [a_{ij}]_{ij} \in \mathbf{M}_{m \times n}(\mathbb{C})$ . Recall that a  $k \times k$  minor of  $A$  is the determinant of a submatrix  $A' \in \mathbf{M}_{k \times k}(\mathbb{C})$  obtained from  $A$  by deleting  $m - k$  rows and  $n - k$  columns. Thus (the value of) each minor is expressible as a polynomial in some entries of  $A$  according to (i). Now note that for  $A$  the fact  $\text{rank}(A) \leq r < \min\{m, n\}$  is equivalent to the vanishing of all  $(r + 1) \times (r + 1)$  minors of  $A$ . As there are

$$s := \binom{m}{r+1} \cdot \binom{n}{r+1}$$

such minors of  $A$ , according to Theorem 4, there are  $s$  polynomials  $q_k(x_{11}, \dots, x_{mn})$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq s$ , in  $mn$  unknowns  $x_{11}, x_{12}, \dots, x_{mn}$  such that  $q_k(A) := q_k(a_{11}, a_{12}, \dots, a_{mn}) = 0$  holds for all  $k = 1, \dots, s$  if and only if  $\text{rank}(A) \leq r$ . In particular, if  $\text{rank}(A) > r$ , there is at least one  $q_k$  such that  $q_k(A) = q_k(a_{11}, \dots, a_{mn}) \neq 0$ .

Do not overlook that, in each case considered in Example 1, the polynomials that have been determined do not depend on a special matrix.

Recall that, according to Theorem 3,  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  is 1-regular if and only if  $I_n, A, A^2, \dots, A^{n-1}$  are linearly independent. In turn this is the case if and only if the matrix

$$M := \begin{bmatrix} | & | & | & \dots & | \\ I_n & A & A^2 & \dots & A^{n-1} \\ | & | & | & \dots & | \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbf{M}_{n^2 \times n}(\mathbb{C}),$$

whose columns are  $I_n, A, A^2, \dots$  written in vectorized fashion as  $n^2 \times 1$  column vectors, has full rank (i.e.  $\text{rank}(M) = n$ ). Certainly, the entries of  $M$  are polynomials in the entries of  $A$ . The matrix  $M$  has  $\text{rank} \leq n - 1$  if and only if all  $n \times n$  minors of  $M$  vanish simultaneously. Taking Example 1 (iii) into account we have the following result:

**Corollary 3.** *There exists a collection of  $s \geq 1$  (nonzero) polynomials  $w_k(x_{11}, \dots, x_{nn}) \in \mathbb{C}[x_{11}, x_{12}, \dots, x_{nn}]$  in  $n^2$  unknowns such that  $w_k(A) = w_k(a_{11}, \dots, a_{nn}) = 0$  holds for  $A = [a_{ij}]_{ij} \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  and all  $w_k, k = 1, \dots, s$ , if and only if  $A$  is not 1-regular.*

In other words, Corollary 3 states that  $w_\ell(A) \neq 0$  for at least one  $\ell, 1 \leq \ell \leq s$ , is sufficient for  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  to be 1-regular. This fact will be very useful for the proofs in the upcoming section.

### 3. DENSITY OF DIAGONALIZABLE MATRICES

In this section we prove our main theorems on the density of diagonalizable matrices in the sets  $\mathbb{J}(B)$ ,  $\mathbb{L}(B)$ ,  $\mathbb{G}(B)$  and  $\mathcal{N}(B)$ . For  $B = B^H$  the Lie and Jordan algebras are treated in Subsection 3.1 whereas the set of  $B$ -unitary matrices and the set of  $B$ -normal matrices are considered in Subsections 3.2 and 3.3, respectively. The case  $B = -B^H$  is considered in Subsection 3.4.

### 3.1 The Lie and Jordan Algebras

We begin by considering the density of diagonalizable matrices in the sets  $\mathbb{J}(B)$  and  $\mathbb{L}(B)$  of  $B$ -selfadjoint and  $B$ -skewadjoint matrices. The result of Proposition 2 will be central for the proof of Theorem 5.

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $B = B^H \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  be nonsingular. Then  $\mathbb{J}(B)$  and  $\mathbb{L}(B)$  contain a matrix with pairwise distinct eigenvalues.*

*Proof.* Let  $(m_-, m_+)$  be the inertia<sup>4</sup> of  $B$ , that is, denote the number of positive real eigenvalues of  $B$  by  $m_+$  and the number of negative real eigenvalues of  $B$  by  $m_-$ . According to a Theorem of Sylvester (cf. [8, Thm. 4.5.7]) there exists some  $Q \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$  such that

$$B' := Q^H B Q = \begin{bmatrix} -I_{m_-} & \\ & I_{m_+} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now for any  $n$  distinct values  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$  the matrix

$$D = \text{diag}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$$

is in  $\mathbb{J}(B')$ . Thus  $A := Q D Q^{-1}$  is in  $\mathbb{J}(Q^{-H}(Q^H B Q)Q^{-1}) = \mathbb{J}(B)$  according to Lemma 2 and has pairwise distinct eigenvalues. The same statement for  $\mathbb{L}(B)$  follows by taking the diagonal entries  $i\alpha_1, \dots, i\alpha_n$  for  $D$ .  $\square$

We now prove the main theorem of this section. Its proof makes use of the fact observed in Example 1 (ii). With the use of Proposition 2 it would also follow from [7, Cor. 1].

**Theorem 5.** *Let  $B = B^H \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ .*

- (a) *For any  $J \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists some diagonalizable  $J' \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  such that  $\|J - J'\|_2 < \varepsilon$ . Moreover,  $J'$  can be chosen to have pairwise distinct eigenvalues.*
- (b) *For any  $L \in \mathbb{L}(B)$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists some diagonalizable  $L' \in \mathbb{L}(B)$  such that  $\|L - L'\|_2 < \varepsilon$ . Moreover,  $L'$  can be chosen to have pairwise distinct eigenvalues.*

*Proof.* Let  $A = [a_{ij}]_{ij} \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . Recall that, according to Example 1 (ii), there is some polynomial

$$q(x_{11}, \dots, x_{nn}) \in \mathbb{C}[x_{11}, x_{12}, \dots, x_{nn}]$$

in  $n^2$  unknowns  $x_{ij}$ ,  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ , such that  $q(A) = q(a_{11}, \dots, a_{nn}) = 0$  if and only if  $A$  has a (i.e. at least one) multiple eigenvalue. Otherwise, that is if all eigenvalues of  $A$  are (pairwise) distinct,  $q(A) \neq 0$ .

---

<sup>4</sup>As  $B \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ , we have  $0 \notin \sigma(B)$ . Moreover, as  $B = B^H$ , all eigenvalues of  $B$  are real. In conclusion  $B$  has only positive and negative real eigenvalues.

(a) Now assume  $J \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ . According to Proposition 2, there is some  $E \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  with distinct eigenvalues. Now consider the family of matrices  $M(z) := zJ + E$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , and the polynomial  $\tilde{q}(z) := q(M(z)) = q(zJ + E) \in \mathbb{C}[z]$  that only depends on the single variable  $z$ . Certainly  $\tilde{q}(0) = q(E) \neq 0$  since the eigenvalues of  $E$  are distinct. Therefore,  $\tilde{q} \neq 0$  and  $\tilde{q}$  is not the zero-polynomial. As  $\tilde{q}(z)$  has only a finite number of roots, almost all matrices  $M(z_0)$ ,  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ , have distinct eigenvalues. Consequently, the same holds for all  $J + cE = c(c^{-1}J + E)$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{C}$ . To guarantee that  $J + cE \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ , we confine ourselves to the case  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  (see Lemma 1).

Now let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be given and choose some  $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $|c_0| < \varepsilon/\|E\|_2$  such that  $\tilde{q}(c_0^{-1}) \neq 0$ . Then  $J' := J + c_0E \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ ,  $J'$  has  $n$  distinct eigenvalues and

$$\|J - J'\|_2 = |c_0| \cdot \|E\|_2 < \frac{\varepsilon}{\|E\|_2} \cdot \|E\|_2 = \varepsilon.$$

Moreover, as  $J'$  has pairwise distinct eigenvalues it is diagonalizable.

(b) The proof for  $L \in \mathbb{L}(B)$  proceeds along the same lines.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.** *Let  $B = B^H \in \mathbf{Gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . The set of matrices with pairwise distinct eigenvalues is dense in  $\mathbb{J}(B)$  and  $\mathbb{L}(B)$ .*

The proof of Theorem 5 also reveals that any matrix from  $\mathbb{J}(B)$  or  $\mathbb{L}(B)$  can always be expressed as a sum of matrices with pairwise distinct eigenvalues from the same class.

**Corollary 5.** *Let  $B = B^H \in \mathbf{Gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . Then every matrix in  $\mathbb{J}(B)$  can be expressed as a sum of two diagonalizable matrices from  $\mathbb{J}(B)$  with pairwise distinct eigenvalues. The same holds for  $\mathbb{L}(B)$ .*

*Proof.* Using the notation from the proof of Theorem 5 (a),  $E \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  and  $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  can be chosen such that  $E$  and  $J + c_0E$  both have  $n$  distinct eigenvalues. Then  $J = (J + c_0E) - c_0E$  is a sum of two matrices  $J + c_0E$ ,  $-c_0E \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  which both have pairwise distinct eigenvalues. The proof follows analogously for  $\mathbb{L}(B)$ .  $\square$

Let  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . Using the decomposition  $A = S + K$  with  $S = (1/2)(A + A^*)$  and  $K = (1/2)(A - A^*)$ , see (2), accompanied by Corollary 5 we end this section with the following observation related to the set  $\mathcal{N}(B)$  of  $B$ -normal matrices.

**Proposition 3.** *Let  $B = B^H \in \mathbf{Gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . Any matrix  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  can be expressed as a sum of four matrices from  $\mathcal{N}(B)$  with each having pairwise distinct eigenvalues.*

*Proof.* As any matrix from  $\mathbb{J}(B)$  and  $\mathbb{L}(B)$  can be expressed as a sum of two matrices with  $n$  distinct eigenvalues from the same class, Corollary 5 can be applied to  $A = S + K$  with  $S = (1/2)(A + A^*) \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  and  $K = (1/2)(A - A^*) \in \mathbb{L}(B)$ .  $\square$

### 3.2 The set $\mathbb{G}(B)$ of $B$ -unitary matrices

In this section we analyze the set  $\mathbb{G}(B)$  and show that it contains a dense subset of diagonalizable matrices. The proof relies on the Cayley transformation (cf. Theorem 2) and uses the result from Theorem 5 (a).

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $B = B^H \in \mathbf{Gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . For any  $G \in \mathbb{G}(B)$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists some diagonalizable  $G' \in \mathbb{G}(B)$  such that  $\|G - G'\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$ .*

*Proof.* Assume  $G \in \mathbb{G}(B)$  is given. Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $|\alpha| = 1$ , be chosen such that  $\alpha \notin \sigma(G)$  and let  $w \neq \bar{w}$  be some fixed number. Then, according to Theorem 2,

$$G' := (wG - \bar{w}\alpha I_n)(G - \alpha I_n)^{-1} \in \mathbb{J}(B)$$

with  $w \notin \sigma(G')$ . By Theorem 5 we may construct a sequence  $(F'_k)_k \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  of diagonalizable matrices with  $F'_k \rightarrow G'$  for  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Again according to Theorem 2,  $F_k := \alpha(F'_k - \bar{w}I_n)(F'_k - wI_n)^{-1} \rightarrow G$  for  $k \rightarrow \infty$  since the transformation is continuous (and both transformations in Theorem 2 are inverse to each other). Certainly,  $w \notin \sigma(F'_k)$  has to hold for  $F_k$  to be defined. However,  $w \notin \sigma(G')$  implies that  $w \notin \sigma(F'_k)$  will hold if  $F'_k$  is close enough to  $G'$  (this can be interpreted as a consequence of the Bauer-Fike Theorem, cf. [5, Thm. 7.2.2], since all  $F'_k$  are diagonalizable). Formally, there is some  $\eta > 0$  such that  $w \notin \sigma(F'_k)$  for all  $F'_k \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  with  $\|G' - F'_k\|_2 < \eta$ . From now on, it suffices to consider only those  $F'_k$  from the sequence which are close enough to  $G'$  such that  $F_k$  is defined.

Now let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be given. Then there exists some  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\|F_k - G\|_2 < \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } F_k \text{ such that } \|F'_k - G'\|_2 < \delta$$

due to the continuity of the transformation. Now choose some  $F'_j$  from the sequence with  $\|F'_j - G'\|_2 < \min\{\delta, \eta\}$  (so, in particular,  $w \notin \sigma(F'_j)$ ). Then  $F_j \in \mathbb{G}(B)$  is defined and  $\|F_j - G\|_2 < \varepsilon$ . As  $F'_j$  is diagonalizable, assume  $S^{-1}F'_jS = D$  for some diagonal  $D \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . Then it follows from a direct calculation that

$$S^{-1}F_jS = \alpha(D - \bar{w}I_n)(D - wI_n)^{-1} \quad (8)$$

is a diagonalization of  $F_j$  and the proof is complete.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.** *Let  $B = B^H \in \mathbf{Gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . The set of matrices with pairwise distinct eigenvalues is dense in  $\mathbb{G}(B)$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from the proof of Theorem 6 and Corollary 4, since the sequence of matrices  $(F'_k)_k \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  constructed in the proof of Theorem 6 can be chosen such that all matrices have pairwise distinct eigenvalues. Then, if  $S^{-1}F'_jS = D$  for some diagonal  $D \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  with  $n$  distinct eigenvalues, the matrix  $S^{-1}F_jS$  in (8) has distinct eigenvalues, too.  $\square$

### 3.3 The set $\mathcal{N}(B)$ of $B$ -normal matrices

We now consider the density of diagonalizable matrices in the set  $\mathcal{N}(B)$  of  $B$ -normal matrices. The following Lemma 4 will be helpful to prove Theorem 7. It shows how to construct  $B$ -normal matrices from pairs of commuting  $B$ -selfadjoint matrices.

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $B = B^H \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . If  $F, G \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  and  $F$  and  $G$  commute, then  $A = F \pm iG \in \mathcal{N}(B)$ .*

*Proof.* Note that

$$A^* = (F \pm iG)^* = B^{-1}(F \pm iG)^H B = B^{-1}F^H B \pm B^{-1}(iG)^H B = F \mp iG$$

so  $AA^* = (F \pm iG)(F \mp iG)$  and  $A^*A = (F \mp iG)(F \pm iG)$ . Since  $FG = GF$  we see that  $AA^* = A^*A$  holds.  $\square$

Theorem 7 states that the density result obtained for  $\mathbb{J}(B), \mathbb{L}(B)$  and  $\mathbb{G}(B)$  before is true for  $\mathcal{N}(B)$  under the additional assumption that  $B$  is a unitary matrix.

**Theorem 7.** *Let  $B \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$  with  $B = B^H$  and  $B^H B = I_n$ . For any  $N \in \mathcal{N}(B)$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists some diagonalizable  $N' \in \mathcal{N}(B)$  such that  $\|N - N'\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $N \in \mathcal{N}(B)$  be arbitrary. We define  $S := \frac{1}{2}(N + N^*) \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ ,  $K := \frac{1}{2}(N - N^*) \in \mathbb{L}(B)$  as in (2) and express  $N$  as

$$N = S + K = S - i^2 K = S - iK_H \quad (9)$$

with  $K_H := iK$ . Notice that  $K_H \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  according to Corollary 1. It follows straight forward that  $SK_H = K_H S$  holds, that is

$$\begin{aligned} SK_H &= (1/2)(A + A^*) \cdot (i/2)(A - A^*) = (i/4)(A + A^*)(A - A^*) \\ &= (i/4)(A - A^*)(A + A^*) = (i/2)(A - A^*) \cdot (1/2)(A + A^*) \\ &= K_H S, \end{aligned}$$

so  $S$  and  $K_H$  commute.

According to Proposition 1 there exists some 1-regular  $E = [e_{ij}]_{ij} \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  such that  $K_H$  and  $E$  commute, that is,  $K_H E = E K_H$  holds. Now, we consider the family of all matrices  $M = M(z) = zS + E \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  for  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ . As both  $S$  and  $E$  commute with  $K_H$ , so does each  $M(z)$ . In particular, note that  $M(0) = E$  is 1-regular.

According to Corollary 3 there is some  $w_\ell(x_{11}, \dots, x_{nn})$  (from the set of polynomials  $w_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, s$ , that vanish simultaneously for matrices that are not 1-regular) such that  $w_\ell(E) = w_\ell(e_{11}, e_{12}, \dots, e_{nn}) \neq 0$ . Now, as  $S$  and  $E$  are fixed, consider  $\tilde{w}(z) := w_\ell(M(z)) = w_\ell(zS + E) \in \mathbb{C}[z]$  as a single-variable-polynomial and notice that  $\tilde{w}(0) = w_\ell(E) \neq 0$ . Thus  $\tilde{w} \neq 0$

is not the zero-polynomial. Recall that  $\tilde{w}(z_0) \neq 0$  is a sufficient condition for  $M(z_0) = z_0S + E$  to be 1-regular. Consequently, as  $\tilde{w}(z)$  does only have a finite number of roots,  $M(z_0) = z_0S + E$  will be 1-regular for almost all  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ . Therefore  $S + cE = c(c^{-1}S + E)$  is also 1-regular for all but a finite number of nonzero  $c \in \mathbb{C}$ .

Now let  $\varepsilon = 2\epsilon > 0$  be given. Choose some  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $|c| \leq \epsilon/(2\|E\|_2)$  such that  $S_c := S + cE \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  is 1-regular. Then

$$\|S - S_c\|_2 = \|cE\|_2 = |c|\|E\|_2 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2\|E\|_2}\|E\|_2 = \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

As  $S_c$  and  $K_H$  commute (recall that  $S$  and  $E$  both commute with  $K_H$ ) and  $S_c$  is 1-regular, there exists some polynomial  $p(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$  with  $p(S_c) = K_H$  according to Theorem 3 (a). Moreover, from Theorem 5 (see also Corollary 4), there exists a sequence  $(F_k)_k \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , of diagonalizable matrices with  $F_k \rightarrow S_c$ . Thus,  $p(F_k) \rightarrow K_H$  for  $k \rightarrow \infty$  since  $p(x)$  is continuous. Now, for  $\epsilon/2$  there exists some  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\|p(S_c) - p(F_k)\|_2 = \|K_H - p(F_k)\|_2 < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad \text{if} \quad \|S_c - F_k\|_2 < \delta \quad (10)$$

due to the continuity of  $p(x)$ . Next, choose some  $F_\ell \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  from the sequence  $(F_k)_k$  with  $\|S_c - F_\ell\| < \min\{\epsilon/2, \delta\}$ . Then we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|S - F_\ell\|_2 &= \|S - S_c + S_c - F_\ell\|_2 \\ &\leq \|S - S_c\|_2 + \|S_c - F_\ell\|_2 < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

As  $p(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$  may have complex coefficients, it might be the case that  $p(F_\ell) \notin \mathbb{J}(B)$ . However,  $G := (1/2)(p(F_\ell) + p(F_\ell)^*) \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  (recall (2)). Assume  $p(x)$  is given by  $\sum_{k=0}^t a_k x^k$  for complex coefficients  $a_k \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, t$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} p(F_\ell)^* &= B^{-1} \left( \sum_{k=0}^t a_k F_\ell^k \right)^H B = B^{-1} \left( \sum_{k=0}^t \overline{a_k} (F_\ell^k)^H \right) B \\ &= B^{-1} \left( \sum_{k=0}^t \overline{a_k} (F_\ell^H)^k \right) B = \sum_{k=0}^t \overline{a_k} (B^{-1} F_\ell^H B)^k = \sum_{k=0}^t \overline{a_k} F_\ell^k, \end{aligned}$$

so  $p(F_\ell)^* = q(F_\ell)$  with  $q(x) = \sum_{k=0}^t \overline{a_k} x^k$ . In particular,  $(1/2)(p(F_\ell) + q(F_\ell)) = r(F_\ell) = \sum_{k=0}^t 2\Re(a_k) F_\ell^k$  is a (real) polynomial in  $F_\ell$  (where  $\Re(a_k)$  denotes the real part of the complex number  $a_k$ ). As

$$\|p(F_\ell) - \frac{1}{2}(p(F_\ell) + p(F_\ell)^*)\|_2 = \|p(F_\ell) - r(F_\ell)\|_2 \leq \|p(F_\ell) - X\|_2$$

holds for any  $X \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  according to Lemma 3 and  $\|p(F_\ell) - K_H\|_2 < \epsilon/2$  (recall (10) and the choice of  $F_\ell$ ) we conclude  $\|p(F_\ell) - r(F_\ell)\|_2 \leq \epsilon/2$ . In

analogy to (11) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|K_H - G\|_2 &= \|K_H - p(F_\ell) + p(F_\ell) - G\|_2 \\ &\leq \|K_H - p(F_\ell)\|_2 + \|p(F_\ell) - G\|_2 < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we arrived at  $\|S - F_\ell\|_2 < \epsilon$  and  $\|K_H - r(F_\ell)\|_2 < \epsilon$ . As  $F_\ell, r(F_\ell) \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ , note that  $N' := F_\ell - ir(F_\ell) \in \mathcal{N}(B)$  according to Lemma 4. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|N - N'\|_2 &= \|(S - iK_H) - (F_\ell - ir(F_\ell))\|_2 = \|(S - F_\ell) - i(K_H - r(F_\ell))\|_2 \\ &\leq \|S - F_\ell\|_2 + \|K_H - r(F_\ell)\|_2 \leq \epsilon + \epsilon = 2\epsilon = \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

As  $F_\ell$  is diagonalizable, so is  $r(F_\ell)$ . In addition, as  $F_\ell$  and  $r(F_\ell)$  commute, they are simultaneously diagonalizable [8, Thm. 1.3.21]. This certainly implies  $N' = F_\ell - ir(F_\ell)$  to be diagonalizable (in particular,  $N'$  is a polynomial in  $F_\ell$ ). Thus we have found a diagonalizable matrix  $N' \in \mathcal{N}(B)$  with distance at most  $\varepsilon$  from  $N$  and the proof is complete.  $\square$

Applying Lemma 2 and using the result of Theorem 7 we may now prove the density of diagonalizable matrices in  $\mathcal{N}(B)$  without the assumption of  $B$  being unitary.

**Theorem 8.** *Let  $B \in \mathbf{Gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$  with  $B = B^H$ . For any  $N \in \mathcal{N}(B)$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists some diagonalizable  $N' \in \mathcal{N}(B)$  such that  $\|N - N'\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$ .*

*Proof.* According to Theorem 7 the statement is true if  $B$  is unitary, so assume  $B \in \mathbf{Gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$  is not unitary. According to [8, Thm. 4.5.7] there exists some  $Q \in \mathbf{Gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$  such that

$$B' := Q^H B Q = \begin{bmatrix} -I_{m_-} & \\ & I_{m_+} \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $m_-$  ( $m_+$ ) is the number of negative (positive) eigenvalues of  $B$ . According to Lemma 2 we have  $Q^{-1}\mathcal{N}(B)Q = \mathcal{N}(B')$ . Since  $B'$  is unitary, Theorem 7 applies and the set of diagonalizable matrices is dense in  $\mathcal{N}(B')$ . As any matrix  $A \in \mathcal{N}(B')$  is diagonalizable if and only if  $Q A Q^{-1} \in \mathcal{N}(B)$  is diagonalizable the density result follows for  $\mathcal{N}(B)$ .  $\square$

In Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 we showed the density results of semisimple matrices for  $B = B^H$ . Hereby,  $B$  was an arbitrary (indefinite) Hermitian matrix. Before we pass on to the case  $B = -B^H$ , do not overlook the special case of  $B$  being positive definite (and  $[\cdot, \cdot]_B$  defining a scalar product). Due to Lemma 2, the same situation as for  $B = I_n$  takes place and all matrices in  $\mathbb{J}(B), \mathbb{L}(B), \mathbb{G}(B)$  and  $\mathcal{N}(B)$  are semisimple. In fact, for a Hermitian positive definite matrix  $B \in \mathbf{Gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$  there exists some  $Q \in \mathbf{Gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$  such that  $Q^H B Q = I_n$ . Whenever  $A \in \mathbb{J}(B)$ , then  $A' := Q^{-1} A Q \in \mathbb{J}(I_n)$  is



Hermitian and, in consequence, semisimple. As semisimplicity is preserved under similarity transformation,  $A$  must have been semisimple, too. The same reasoning holds in an analogous way for  $\mathbb{L}(B)$ ,  $\mathbb{G}(B)$  and  $\mathcal{N}(B)$  using Lemma 2.

### 3.4 Skew-Hermitian Sesquilinear Forms

We now consider the case where  $B = -B^H \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$  is a skew-Hermitian matrix<sup>5</sup>. Fortunately, this situation can be completely traced back to the analysis from Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3.

First note that, if  $B = -B^H$  holds, then  $iB$  is Hermitian (i.e.  $(iB)^H = -iB^H = iB$ ). Moreover we have that

$$(iB)^{-1}A^H(iB) = -iB^{-1}A^H(iB) = -i^2B^{-1}A^HB = B^{-1}A^HB.$$

This shows that  $A \in \mathbb{J}(B)$  ( $A \in \mathbb{L}(B)$ , resp.) if and only if  $A \in \mathbb{J}(iB)$  ( $A \in \mathbb{L}(iB)$ , resp.). Moreover

$$A^H(iB)A = iB \Leftrightarrow i(A^HBA) = iB \Leftrightarrow A^HBA = B,$$

so  $A \in \mathbb{G}(B)$  if and only if  $A \in \mathbb{G}(iB)$ . Finally, the same reasoning reveals that  $\mathcal{N}(B) = \mathcal{N}(iB)$ . Therefore, some matrix in any of these sets corresponding to  $B$  can always be interpreted as a matrix from the same set corresponding to  $iB$ . The main theorems obtained in the previous sections thus apply directly when  $B = -B^H$ .

**Theorem 9.** *Let  $B \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$  with  $B = -B^H$ . For any  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  in any of the sets  $\mathbb{J}(B), \mathbb{L}(B), \mathbb{G}(B), \mathcal{N}(B)$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists some diagonalizable  $A' \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  belonging to the same set such that  $\|A - A'\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$ . In addition, the set of matrices with pairwise distinct eigenvalues is dense in  $\mathbb{J}(B), \mathbb{L}(B)$  and  $\mathbb{G}(B)$ .*

*Proof.* Any matrix  $A \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  from  $\mathbb{J}(B), \mathbb{L}(B), \mathbb{G}(B)$  or  $\mathcal{N}(B)$  can be interpreted as a matrix from  $\mathbb{J}(iB), \mathbb{L}(iB), \mathbb{G}(iB)$  or  $\mathcal{N}(iB)$ , respectively, and Theorems 5, 6 and 8 apply.  $\square$

Certainly, there are analogous results for the case  $B = -B^H$  as stated in Corollary 5 and Proposition 3.

## 4. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we considered the structure classes of  $B$ -selfadjoint,  $B$ -skew-adjoint,  $B$ -unitary and  $B$ -normal matrices defined by an (indefinite) scalar product  $[x, y] = x^H B y$  on  $\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n$  for some  $B \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . We showed that, if  $B = \pm B^H$ , the set of semisimple (i.e. diagonalizable) matrices is dense in the set of all  $B$ -selfadjoint,  $B$ -skewadjoint,  $B$ -unitary and  $B$ -normal matrices.

---

<sup>5</sup>Notice that  $n$  needs to be even for  $B = -B^H$  to be nonsingular.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. V. Arkhangel'skii and L. S. Pontryagin(Eds.). *General Topology I*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 1990.
- [2] R. J. de la Cruz and P. Saltenberger *Generic canonical forms for perplectic and symplectic normal matrices*. Preprint ArXiv 2006.16790v1, 2020.
- [3] K. Fan and A. J. Hoffmann. *Some metric inequalities in the space of matrices*. Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 6, pp. 111-116, 1955.
- [4] I. Gohberg, P. Lancaster and L. Rodman. *Indefinite Linear Algebra and Applications*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2005.
- [5] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan. *Matrix Computations (3rd Edition)*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1996.
- [6] R. Grone, C. R. Johnson, E. M. Sa and H. Wolkowicz. *Normal matrices*. Linear Algebra and its Applications 87, pp. 213–225, 1987.
- [7] D. J. Hartfiel. *Dense sets of diagonalizable matrices*. Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 123, pp. 1669–1672, 1995.
- [8] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis (2nd Edition)*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2013.
- [9] N. Jacobson. *Basic Algebra 1 (2nd Edition)*. H. W. Freeman and Company, New York, 1985.
- [10] P. Lancaster and L. Rodman. *Algebraic Riccati Equations*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995.
- [11] D. W. Lewis. *Matrix Theory*. World Scientific Publishing, Singapore, 1991.
- [12] D. S. Mackey, N. Mackey and F. Tisseur. *On the definition of two natural classes of scalar product*. MIMS Eprint 2007.64, Manchester Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Manchester, 2007.
- [13] C. Mehl. *On classification of normal matrices in indefinite inner product spaces*. The Electronic Journal of Linear Algebra 15 (1), pp. 50–83, 2006.
- [14] K. C. O'Meara, J. Clark and C. I. Vinsonhaler. *Advanced Topics in Linear Algebra*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011.

- [15] P. Saltenberger. *On different concepts for the linearization of matrix polynomials and canonical canonical decompositions of structured matrices with respect to indefinite sesquilinear forms*. Logos Verlag, Berlin, 2019.